

Today's Topics:

ARRL (2 msgs)
Bruce's additional comments on License Processing
Kenwood TS140
Packet compression, what issue?
University Amateur Radio Clubs

Date: 21 Dec 89 06:50:22 GMT

From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!wuarchive!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
tank!cps3xx!usenet@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Usenet file owner)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <5870@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <10006@microsoft.UUCP> clayj@microsoft.UUCP (Clay Jackson) writes:

>[stuff deleted]

>First, I don't recall ANYONE at ARRL, including Rinaldo, EVER saying that
>there would no longer be ANY microwave coverage in QST, or that the
>League was "TOTALLY DROPPING ALL" microwave coverage/support.

This is exactly what they have done. They have dropped ALL coverage of microwave activity and techniques IN QST. They claim to still support microwaves, but conference proceedings are not the same as a regular monthly column in the magazine that every ARRL member receives.

>I think that we need to give Rinaldo and the League a break. The job of
>publishing a single magazine that acts as a "flagship" publication for
>ALL members in an organization as diverse as the ARRL is a TOUGH one
>(I have been involved in a similar situation in another, smaller, less
>diverse organization, and I KNOW whereof I speak). The decision to
>drop ONE column (which was, you have to admit, a column that catered
>entirely to a minority) in favor of more coverage of "general interest"
>is certainly not an indication that the minority has somehow been
>completely and totally disenfranchised.

Of course it is. Rinaldo has dropped all microwave coverage in QST solely to save money. No other single interest group had their column entirely removed. Others had their columns shortened, but the microwave community was singled out for total removal.

>I'm not saying that I agree totally with the ARRL, or that I necessarily
>like ALL of QST (for example, I personally would like to see more
>"novice" type articles, but I'm NOT going to drop my membership if
>Rinaldo decides to publish fewer "Novice notes" columns.

You don't have to like all of it. I don't particularly care for any of

the HF stuff, or YL stuff. However, the ARRL claims to be a representative of ALL of amateur radio. They are hypocrites, plain and simple. They should support all special interest groups if they want to make the kind of claims that they make.

>IMHO, if you don't belong, you don't have the right to complain.

I belong. I have a right to complain. However, there is nobody at Newington who cares what I (or any other microwave operators) say.

>Clay Jackson

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: 21 Dec 89 06:57:16 GMT
From: netnews.upenn.edu!cps3xx!usenet@rutgers.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <5871@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <2564@wyse.wyse.com> steve@wyse.UUCP (Steve Wilson xttemp dept303) writes:

>You can only effect the way the league is going to move if you
>voice your opinions to the elected officials AND remain a member.
>73's de Steve KA6S

I tried this, Steve, and I got nowhere. I sent numerous letters, and all I got in return was form letters bragging about how the league was now publishing the proceedings from various microwave conferences. Nobody ever even read the letters that I sent, or they would have seen that what I was asking for was coverage (even if only just a little) _IN_ _QST_ so that the general amateur public would be informed about what is going on. I have determined that I cannot have any effect on the league. I cannot support their hypocrisy any longer.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: Wed, 20 Dec 89 23:38:22 CST
From: rlwest@flop2.csc.ti.com (Bob West, WA8YCD)
Subject: Bruce's additional comments on License Processing
Message-ID: <8912210546.AA02809@ti.com>

> Let's not impugn the FCC so unfairly! The problem both you guys are having
> is with your VEC, not the folks in Gettysburg. I'm a VE with the Sunnyvale,
> Ca. VEC, and I guarantee you that the FCC is utterly predictable.

On the contrary, I thought 45 days was GOOD. The other guy is flaming
(slightly) I guess, but I really don't mean to. Those folks have plenty
to keep 'em busy, and I was amazed at the consistency with which we got
licenses back in a *reasonable* amount of time!

> We give
> our exams on Sunday, and the successful candidates get their tickets EXACTLY
> 29 days later--in Monday's mail.

That's terrific! I guess it takes about a week in the mail from Gettysburg to
the licensee? Any comment? I assume that'll be the same for everyone, since
the outbound license does not go through the VEC.

> Now it is true that we express mail all of
> our 610's immediately after the exams, but then we feel we're here to serve!

One might infer from this that in addition to processing time at the VEC,
there is also significant time in the US Mail.

(I have no information that suggests that Fred uses anything else.)

> Now it is known that the ARRL VEC has a nasty habit of sitting on the 610's
> before sending them in, and people here locally who took their exams with the
> ARRL end up waiting ABOUT six weeks. But it's not the FCC's fault.

I can't really comment on ARRL VEC, I've had very little dealings with them.
I am working with a group in the W5YI-VEC, and am commenting on the results
from that.

> Another thing I would mention in this regard is that the VEC cannot mail in
> a 610 if there is a license application pending with the FCC. We will hold
> them until the application on file has been processed AND a photocopy of the
> license sent to the VEC.

W5YI does the same.

Thanks for the comments, Bruce, it gives me a broader picture of what is
going on. (Anybody else have similar comments???)

73,
Bob West
WA8YCD

RLWEST@FLOPN2.CSC.TI.COM
Texins Amateur Radio Club
Dallas TX

Date: 20 Dec 89 21:11:34 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!van-bc!ubc-cs!alberta!adec23!mark@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Mark Salyzyn)
Subject: Kenwood TS140
Message-ID: <1989Dec20.211134.25076@adec23.uucp>

In article <1771@ulb.isc.rit.edu>, cep4478@ulb.isc.rit.edu (C.E. Piggott) writes:

> >I am considering purchasing a Kenwood TS140. I would like to receive
> I like the 440 more. The \$500 difference for a TS440S (with the built
> in antenna tuner) is worth it, if only for direct frequency entry
> keypad and SWR meter.

I agree, but the 440 is USELESS in mobile because of it's size (even in my BIG SABLE), but each to his own opinion.

> The only thing that I wish they BOTH had is
> a built-in electronic keying unit.

That and a decent Noise Blanker would be nice. ICOM 735/751 can take an S20 woodpecker down to barely perceptible, the only way to get rid of woodpecker on 440 was to depress the power switch :-).

> 745 is a great rig, except no QSK (only semi-breakin) and it's 100 watts
> (Kenwoods are 200w)

Kenwood specs 200W input, ICOM specs 100W output, no difference !!!!
Also ICOM provides 100W output on FM where Kenwood gets only 100 W input(half power, actually 50W output) on FM. The 745 and 735 can take 100W output continuous while the 140 is limited to about 30 minutes (big deal since most QSO's are under that limit). The ICOM receiver is MUCH better, but that is mute in a mobile if that's your bag.

> Don't forget about the Yaesu 747, it looks pretty neat for the price,
Kenwoods are pretty rigs, yup, most others are ugly. The 747 is the BEST BANG FOR THE BUCK but you do get what you pay for. You will get nicled and dimes to death to get full featured (FM is an add on). I'd use the 747 for mobile because it is simple to use in a mobile and can take a fair amount of abuse since the loan gets paid off quicker :-).

73 de VE6MGS, Ciao
-- Mark Salyzyn alberta!adec23!mark
--

Ciao,
-- Mark Salyzyn @ alberta!adec23!mark

Date: 21 Dec 89 00:54:08 GMT
From: hpl-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@hplabs.hp.com (Alan Bloom)
Subject: Packet compression, what issue?
Message-ID: <1250102@hpnmdla.HP.COM>

It's ALREADY illegal to send codes or ciphers on Amateur Radio, except for generally-recognized abbreviations or "signals". I think the idea is that the purpose of the encoding is to facilitate communications, not to obscure the meaning.

Seems to me this is the key -- If you are ARC'ing a file to save transmission bandwidth, than that conforms to the spirit of the FCC rules, if you are encoding the transmission in order to obscure the meaning, then you're out of line.

Al N1AL

Date: 21 Dec 89 06:24:23 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!wuarchive!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!tank!cps3xx!usenet@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: University Amateur Radio Clubs
Message-ID: <5868@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <1989Dec19.173033.1375@usenet.ins.cwru.edu> dkazdan@cwsys2.UUCP (David Kazdan) writes:

>In article <9824.258DD331@stjhmc.fidonet.org> Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org (Jim Grubs) writes:

>>> From: cep4478@ultb.isc.rit.edu (C.E. Piggott)

>> > I am trying my best to compile a list of amateur radio clubs at

>> > colleges and universities around north america and the world. I'd

>Try writing to W1MX, the MIT Radio Society. They may not have much in the way

>of written records, but there is an interesting wall of college station QSL cards

>that would at least be a starting point.

>--David, AD8Y

You could also try W8YY, at Michigan Technological University, and W8SH at Michigan State University. Both clubs have some documentation regarding their history, past radios, members, station locations, etc.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825

Internet: kjh@usc.edu

UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1049
